

Rt 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
6/24/79

Mr. Joseph L. Schott
4004 El Campo
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Dear Mr. Schott,

By way of introduction, I am one who compelled ^{high FBI officials} ~~the Director~~ to lead the Founding Director into a left turn to save his face - but before your book was out.

For your collection of left-turn stories, if you collect them, here it is.

Director Hoover testified that the reason the assassin did not fire at the President while the motorcade was on Houston Street is because there were trees in the way. In the ~~first~~ ^{second} of my six books on the JFK assassination I quoted Hoover's testimony and printed a Secret Service photograph showing that there was not a single tree on Houston.

What to do when the Director who was always right was proven to be wrong?

As I recall the solution was by or over the signature of Alex Rosen. It consisted of an account of the motorcade route in that area, beginning on Main, saying that there was then a turn into Houston, after which there was this left turn onto Elm, which took the motorcade into a "park." There were many trees in the park. Therefore the Director was correct. Accompanied by nasty cracks about me, albeit more reserved than some I've obtained through more FOIA litigation that I can or want to recall.

As the result of the suit reported in the enclosed Washington Post clipping I have obtained all the FBI's so-called general releases of JFK assassination records, more than 100,000 pages. After reading an appreciable percentage of these and countless other FBI records I believe my use of "sifting and concealing" is too much of an understatement.

One of its more accomplished performances of this nature is the one in ~~you~~ which you are reported in the enclosed FD302, the Hosty flap over the Oswald visit/note. It ~~was~~ ^{was} contrived to end with the impossibility of determining who swore falsely and it did end that way. It began with such limited and primitive questioning by Bassett and others that some of those interviewed were interviewed twice more on the same matter, as what others said made it necessary.

All those established as having knowledge were not interviewed and I'd not be surprised if you made a good guess or two.

Like you the late W.C. Sullivan refused to provide an affidavit.

You are quoted as describing what happened as "kind of a fraud against history." To me it is this and is only part of a much larger fraud against more than history. I am doing what I can to reduce this to the minimum possible and to bring to light all that I can. All my records are bequeathed to a university archive.

For more than a year I've been hoping to be able to accept the invitation of a friend to return to Dallas and continue my inquiries. However, my age (66₊) and health (circulatory problems, venous and arterial) plus the amount of time the Bureau and its Department counsel can waste for me in court combine to prevent this for the time being.

Having come to the copy of the FD302 I made to be able to give you when I did get to Dallas again I've decided instead to mail it, even though I do hope to get to Dallas, perhaps by or in the fall.

What you said or what else you said need not be indicated in this record. And I do not pretend to know the antecedents of the leak. Your reference to Director Kelley has some support from the fact that Hosty made a personal appeal to him when he was in KC. So from that Kelley had knowledge prior to the leak.

My own view is that there was no leak before Shanklin's retirement was secure may be significant in the timing.

As a former reporter I'm surprised that the Times-Herald sat on the story for as long as it did. It had to be certain that FBIHQ would not leak it to anyone else.

However, I had indications of something like this years ago. I was never able to get any confirmation. What I received was represented as coming from a former SA who had worked with Hosty. It was not identical with what emerged after the leak.

The amount of time required by these FOIA efforts has effectively prevented my writing. I still hope to be able to write more. One of the matters I hope to address is the possibility of any Oswald/Bureau relationship.

Much else was covered up. Before long you should read some of this in what I have provided Earl Goltz and he is following up on.

If there is any way you can help or contribute to my knowledge or direct my thinking I would appreciate it. I do not ask that you violate any confidences and I assure you that when asked I keep confidences.

From what I have obtained and what I have been told the FBI has a special hatred of me and of my work. I am not what is called a conspiracy theorist. I deal with fact. In what I have received from the FBI it has not been able to flaw my writing. This was so frustrating to it that it actually concocted a scheme to have former SA Lyndal Shaneyfelt file a spurious libel suit against me for the purpose of #stopping" me and my writing. Two different SAs used this expression and determination. In the end they chickened out. When I learned of this, while deposing Shaneyfelt, I gave the AUSA and the FBI Legal Counsel representative a waiver on the statute and sent one in writing to the since-silent Shaneyfelt.

Despite my by now extensive experience with the FBI's cover-the-ass paper and fabrications for this purpose I was aghast at some of its fabrications about my wife and me and the high-level distribution of it, to the White House and all AGs and DAGs.

An annual religious outing at a farm we owned of September was converted into a celebration of the Russian Revolution, with all dates omitted. When I blundered into Cointelpro in 1969 and reported this to the Department that was transposed into me conspiring with my source, a notorious racist, to besearch the FBI. Etc.etc. ad nauseam.

I go into this on the chance you may have known or heard of some of the FBI's distribution of such stuff. It has been stonewalling my Privacy Act request for years. Dallas provided virtually nothing. More, when I was able to show that the records I did obtain were false and disclosed Cointelproing me all further compliance was suspended.

The Bureau, which is unable to fault my work in any other way, has been running a large campaign of a personal nature to undermine my credibility. It succeeded with LBJ and with the AGs and DAGs. It is for this reason that, with my increased age and imperfect health, I am anxious to be able to obtain and respond to all its false paper.

I am not anti-FBI. More than 40 years ago, when I was a Senate investigator, the Department borrowed me for a major prosecution of the time, a Harlan County, Ky. case. I lived and worked with the SAs and Department lawyers. Some of the SAs, one in particular, were among the finest people I've ever known. I also am not CIA. I was in OSS. However, I would like very much to see both agencies function better than they have and I think they and the country will be better off if and when this happens^s.

Thanks for any help or suggestions you may have.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Rt 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
6/24/79

Mr. Joseph L. Schott
4004 El Camapo
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Dear Mr. Schott,

high FBI officials

By way of introduction, I am one who compelled ~~themselves~~ to lead the Founding Director into a left turn to save his face - but before your book was out.

For your collection of left-turn stories, if you collect them, here it is.

Director Hooper testified that the reason the assassin did not fire at the President while the motorcade was on Houston Street is because there were trees in the way. In the ^{second} ~~first~~ of my six books on the JFK assassination I quoted Hoover's testimony and printed a Secret Service photograph showing that there was not a single tree on Houston.

What to do when the Director who was always right was proven to be wrong?

As I recall the solution was by or over the signature of Alex Rosen. It consisted of an account of the motorcade route in that area, beginning on Main, saying that there was then a turn into Houston, after which there was this left turn onto Elm, which took the motorcade into a "park." There were many trees in the park. Therefore the Director was correct. Accompanied by nasty cracks about me, albeit more reserved than some I've obtained through more FOIA litigation that I can or want to recall.

As the result of the suit reported in the enclosed Washington Post clipping I have obtained all the FBI's so-called general releases of JFK assassination records, more than 100,000 pages. After reading an appreciable percentage of these and countless other FBI records I believe my use of "sifting and concealing" is too much of an understatement.

One of its more accomplished performances of this nature is the one in ~~you~~ which you are reported in the enclosed FD302, the Hosty flap over the Oswald visit/note. It ~~was~~ contrived to end with the impossibility of determining who swore falsely and it did end that way. It began with such limited and primitive questioning by Bassett and others that some of those interviewed were interviewed twice more on the same matter, as what others said made it necessary.

All those established as having knowledge were not interviewed and I'd not be surprised if you made a good guess or two.

Like you the late W.C. Sullivan refused to provide an affidavit.

You are quoted as describing what happened as "kind of a fraud against history." To me it is this and is only part of a much larger fraud against more than history. I am doing what I can to reduce this to the minimum possible and to bring to light all that I can. All my records are bequeathed to a university archive.

For more than a year I've been hoping to be able to accept the invitation of a friend to return to Dallas and continue my inquiries. However, my age (66₊) and health (circulatory problems, venous and arterial) plus the amount of time the Bureau and its Department counsel can waste for me in court combine to prevent this for the time being.

Having come to the copy of the FD302 I made to be able to give you when I did get to Dallas again I've decided instead to mail it, even though I do hope to get to Dallas, perhaps by or in the fall.

What you said or what else you said need not be indicated in this record. And I do not pretend to know the antecedents of the leak. Your reference to Director Kelley has some support from the fact that Hosty made a personal appeal to him when he was in KC. So from that Kelley had knowledge prior to the leak.

My own view is that there was no leak before Shanklin's retirement was secure may be significant in the timing.

As a former reporter I'm surprised that the Times-Herald sat on the story for as long as it did. It had to be certain that FBIHQ would not leak it to anyone else.

However, I had indications of something like this years ago. I was never able to get any confirmation. What I received was represented as coming from a former SA who had worked with Hosty. It was not identical with what emerged after the leak.

The amount of time required by these FOIA efforts has effectively prevented my writing. I still hope to be able to write more. One of the matters I hope to address is the possibility of any Oswald/Bureau relationship.

Much else was covered up. Before long you should read some of this in what I have provided Earl Golz and he is following up on.

If there is any way you can help or contribute to my knowledge or direct my thinking I would appreciate it. I do not ask that you violate any confidences and I assure you that when asked I keep confidences.

From what I have obtained and what I have been told the FBI has a special hatred of me and of my work. I am not what is called a conspiracy theorist. I deal with fact. In what I have received from the FBI it has not been able to flaw my writing. This was so frustrating to it that it actually concocted a scheme to have former SA Lyndal Shaneyfelt file a spurious libel suit against me for the purpose of "stopping" me and my writing. Two different SAs used this expression and determination. In the end they chickened out. When I learned of this, while deposing Shaneyfelt, I gave the AUSA and the FBI Legal Counsel representative a waiver on the statute and sent one in writing to the since-silent Shaneyfelt.

Despite my buy now extensive experience with the FBI's cover-the-ass paper and fabrications for this purpose I was aghast at some of its fabrications about my wife and me and the high-level distribution of it, to the White House and all AGs and DAGs.

An annual religious outing at a farm we owned of September was converted into a celebration of the Russian Revolution, with all dates omitted. When I blundered into Cointelpro in 1969 and reported this to the Department that was transposed into me conspiring with my source, a notorious racist, to besmirch the FBI. Etc.etc. ad nauseam.

I go into this on the chance you may have known or heard of some of the FBI's distribution of such stuff. It has been stonewalling my Privacy Act request for years. Dallas provided virtually nothing. More, when I was able to show that the records I did obtain were false and disclosed Cointelproing me all further compliance was suspended.

The Bureau, which is unable to fault my work in any other way, has been running a large campaign of a personal nature to undermine my credibility. It succeeded with LBJ and with the AGs and DAGs. It is for this reason that, with my increased age and imperfect health, I am anxious to be able to obtain and respond to all its false paper.

I am not anti-FBI. More than 40 years ago, when I was a Senate investigator, the Department borrowed me for a major prosecution of the time, a Harlan County, Ky. case. I lived and worked with the SAs and Department lawyers. Some of the SAs, one in particular, were among the finest people I've ever known. I also am not CIA. I was in OSS. However, I would like very much to see both agencies function better than they have and I think they and the country will be better off if and when this happens.

Thanks for any help or suggestions you may have.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg